TUESDAY JANUARY 28, 1964
PLAYED ON MAY 14, 1964

Payment for groups.
Conversation during the week in which a group memeber said that Mr. Nyland spoke disparagingly about William James, Spinoza, etc. How do such misunderstandings arise; how does one listen?
Statements about work can be checked thru Beelzebub. Value of Beelzebub at different stages in development. The logicality of generalizations made by Gurdjieff which are based on one example.
Excuse for not working must not be that one is not clear about what to do. The value of the Friday seminar.

Taylor Morris: Would like to talk about Gurdjieff at seminar at Unitarian Church.
Mr. Nyland: Talking about ideas must come because they have questions.

Robert Viespi: Brought friend to the group; how far should he go in answering her questions?
Mr. Nyland: First see where question comes from. Then relate that to your experience and asnwer as if it is your question. Answer should leave something unsaid. When a person starts to grow then you can answer at length.

Alice Watson: Daly King gives seven points for full awareness.
Mr. Nyland: Words cannot describe objectivity because they are subjective. As one changes because of work, mind also changes in abaility to have more inclusive awareness. In moment of awareness one is a unit and therefore the awareness is absolute. King's approach from a wrong point of view. Work shifts from mind to become a deep seated wish in the heart. Then wish is to be rather than to understand.

John Marshall: Cannot transfer wish from mind to heart.
Mr. Nyland: Can only be accomplished thru work. Coming back to the effort. The possibility of eventually knowing when one loses consciousness.

Trudy Bartel: Lack of strenght rather than loss of interest creates loss of awareness.
Mr. Nyland: How one can oppose the influences which take away the energy. Withdrawl and then participation.

Trudy Bartel: How can I learn what my type is.
Mr. Nyland: Three factors which determine type. Possibility of 81 types according to development of subcenters. Groups of three and four according tb the Zodiac. Disucssion of ~~xkx~~ astrological unfluences. For practical work one should see how one reacts to poeple of different types. As with chief feature, it is necessary to first undo outer covering before one can determing essential type.

Marvin Schwartz: Between two shores of the river.
Mr. Nyland: That what one loses of Earthly value has to be replaced by something not of the Earth. Building up speed different from breaking down speed. Task to get up early in the morning.

Using the energy of outside forces to remainx awake.

TUESDAY JANUARY 28, 1964
PLAYED ON MAY 14, 1964

This is the last Tuesday in the month. I just want to remind you of my particular statements regarding finances so everybody understands it the way I meant it. That is, that you commit yourself for a month. And if you pay three dollars at the door or fifteen per month, it all comes to the same; not that the amount is the same, but the obligation is the same. That is you, for some reason or other, belong to Tuesday group do not pay because you cannot come, you remain responsible for the money so that at the end of the month you must have paid either twelve or fifteen. Some months there are five Tuesdays in the month and you pay fifteen. It would be convenient if you could pay by the month; not for the money but for the book keeping and so forth. Also, we have to talk about the question of an office for which we may have to pay if there is something that looks like a meeting place. We have to pay more money. Wesley and John we have to get together afterwards.

Events of the week. *??- with what happens during the week and conversarions that one has during that time very pften put me in a certain state of what is not clear or what did I not do to make things clear. And I start to accuse myself because maybe I am not clear. Maybe I do not say everything logically, the way I ought to say it or build it up.

But it is very interesting that one of us in the groups made a remark to me that I mentioned a couple of months ago four people - James - William James, Spinoza, Walt Whitman and Buddha. And I talked, according to this person, sarcastically and disparagingly about them; saying that there were no good as compared to Gurdjieff;

that Gurdjieff knew it all and that therefore such perople were not really worthwhile. Now, how in God's name this kind of statement can ever come out of my mouth, according to such a report, I do not know because to link up, of course, Spinoza I know a little bit about. Walt Whitam I do not like so much - but that is neither here nor there. Ther are, in Leaves of Grass, some statements that are very very interesting. William James I admire a great deal; partly because of Varieties of Religious Experience and partly because of his openness regarding psychical research. And then Buddha - how I can link them up with Buddha because Buddha is just, in my opinion, the only one where I many times have said, "Read the Only Way, the little book by Woodward or the Meditiation of How To Be, described by Buddha, which is identical to Gurdjieff; which is something where it shows that Gurdjieff was talking about something that other people also have known; that he never claimed that he himself was the only but but that he got informtation from other sources.

How it can happen that I was misunderstood or that I, at a moment of abberation, I said certain things that I am not accountable for --- I cannot understand it. You can say there are tapes; we can listen to them. But I know damn well I cannot have said it. It is utterly impossible. And that whatever I may have said has been misinterpreted in such a way. And this really makes me sometimes realize what is the trouble wither with me or with others who listen and how listen probably very intently. Are we so completely closed that sometimes certain statements cannot enter? Or, when they do enter, they enter in such a way that immediately they become colored in accordance with ones own personal interpretation of what you like or hope for or what you are looking for, without

really listening.

So, it made me think: What is it at the present time, regarding work, that is not clear? That is, if there is something that you do not know and it is possible to talk about it and perhaps it is possible that I can explain it, in any event if it is possible I will explain it in accordance with what my understanding is of it; then let's have it out, let's have it in the open so that there is no possiblity whatsoever that you mistake it. And then, if I say certain things, that you start checking it if you wish thru Beelzebub, thru whatever source you want to follow so that it becomes quite clear to you what work means,

I would like to add something to that because Gurdjieff of course is very often misunderstood. And there are many things in All and Everything in whatever he may have said which at certain times are quite impossible to believe; and that anyone who does not keep an open mind for the possibility that later on he might understand it, is a person who really is not worthwhile enough to consider Gurdjieff a person who has lived and has given something that really I call it remarkable.

But one must understand this: That at anyone time in ones own development there are certain things in All and Everything that you can take and that you can apply and you can verify it with your own experience. At the same time, there may be several things which you do not take and cannot take and perhaps never will be able to take because you are not the kind of person who can be all around in experiencings; whereas Gurdjieff probably was a little bit more than what we are. At the same time, it als has to be quite clear that Gurdjieff took

every once in a while an example of certain things happening on Earth and with this he generalized simply because, if it can happen once, it can happen again. And that even if it only happened once, it was an event which happened on Earth and, as such, became a certain something as possible on Earth. And, for that reason, he emphasized it; and that maybe that there was only one person who corresponded to that and, as a result, every one who might read Beelzebub may not agree with that one particular thing.

Of course such things are possible and/the only way out is if one understands All and Everything for what Gurdjieff meant it to be, that is, a method to find out for oneself what one is, to have a criticism and impartially of oneself and to try already in All and Everything, in any event, to try to indicate in what direction there is a possibility of work on oneself and what may be meant. That of course All and Everything does not as yet give in detail certain fundamental truths regarding a method and that much more of that occurs in the third series which he explains very well; that in the third series it is actually given how to live as one is so that only then that kind of reality could become part of one.

So, you might sat that All and Everything, the Beelzebub book, is not entirely complete but certainly is in line with whatever might follow. And that even if there are certain things that one does not understand, one has to take ir on the basis of what do I understand for myself as an experience, regardless of a description of possible experiences of other people which are not my experiences. You can say to some extent that either Gurdjieff exaggerates or that he is a little bit to all encompassing and not straight enough and bases generalities and general statments on not enough material to base a law on. Perhaps to

some extent, scientifically speaking, that is right because there may be in that affair tremendous probable error; that if it is only based on one person it may not apply to me at all. But that what does not apply does not count. If I see in other people what takes place in them as being a machine, I have to look at myself, what I am as a machine. And the only reason why Gurdjieff can have a meaning for any one of us is by comparing that what he says with our own experience.

Again, what I have said just now referred to a conversation I had with someone who was a little critical and thought that perhaps Gurdjieff ought to be put down a couple of pegs and not to be admired. It happened to be a person who has studied himself quite a bit. And, of course, anyone who has studied, any one who has a certain amount of knowledge for himself - it happened to be a teacher too - or a person who is like an artist who has accomplished certain things and created certain things is liable to believe that thet already know. And then, in manking certain distinctions, particularly in ordinary life of great art and small art of classical and not classical, which are very easily misunderstood in the terminology of Gurdjieff when it compares great nature with small nature.

So, all of this brings me to the real question: what is it that we do not know in its simplicity so that there is no excuse for not working as long as we know what is meant. The excuses for not working of course are varied but they must not depend on an intelligent knowledge of what is required. They will depend, quite logically, on the state in which one is, the condition, the tremendous avalanche of ordinary affairs of life on one, many conditions emotionally, particularly when one is involved in a variety of things of life, that it is impossib e to work or a state in which one is or the conditions that

cannot be changed and which one has to run up against as if with the head against the wall or that one is in such psychological pain that even the thought of work hurts. All of that one can agree on. One must know this for oneself. But the excuse nevera must be that I do not know intellectually what is a description of the only way.

Now, what questions are there and what are things that we can talk about in order to elucidate or to help each other to get again and again in front of us the ideas of work for a whole week and what can we do with it? I hope you foolow what I have suggested, every week end to think about the week that has passed. I hope you also make for yourself certain tasks. I hope you will also include in that talkp ing about the ideas with other people.

And, in connoetion with that, I will mention that the opportunity to find out what one knows is a very good onemx on Friday evening. And that I, to some extent. I have said it before, I rely a little on the Tuesday group to come every once in a while; not all of you; but every once in a while some must make an attempt to come to that Friday in order to help bring up the level of tht Friday to a general discussion or, as I call it, a seminar and not a monologue on my part or just a few questions and then a long recitation about how it is and what it is and so forth as an answer. I do not want to be forced to talk too much. I want to delegate it as much as it is possible to any one who feels that they can talk and must talk and want to find out in their own way and expressing in their way in order to become clearer and clearer, I would almost say, to find out what you do not know or how sometimes , how difficult it is to put it in certain words. And still, you have to go thru this. If you cannot explain it to someone else, I doubt very much that you can explain it to yourself. If it is clear to

yourself, you can say it to someone else. The only difficulty in answering such a question is that you understand first where is the person who asks the question. And then, whatever you answer is that it starts to link up with that question and then you embellish it, enlarge it, or you ddepen it in accordance with the ideas of work.

Taylor Morris: Mr. Nyland, this question is about talking to other people about the work and possibly bringing other people to the work. Today I was talking to a teacher about All and Everything which I happened to have a copy of with me. And he had read about Gurdjieff and he had read about Ouspensky. And he said that he belongs to a church called the Unitarian Church or else the Universalist. At any rate they have meetings on Tusday nights and they talk about various things. They try and at that time they have a kind of a seminar themselves and they open themselves to ...

Mr. Nyland: What kind of church is it?

Taylor: I think it is the Unitarian Church. I was wondering if you had any idea as to how some of the ideas might be ... what would be a good idea?

Mr. Nyland: Why don't you go sometime?

Taylor: I would like to go.

Mr. Nyland: Where is it?

Taylor: It is on 76th, on the west side.

Mr. Nyland: Can anyone go or do you have to have an introduction?

Taylor: I think it is a fairly open meeting. I was wondering if it would be possible maybe to have a tape or a part of tape.

Mr. Nyland: No. Let's find out first what goes on. A tape or even answering certain ideas about Gurdjieff is never right unless threre is a question for it. If they want to find out, probably there are means of teeling them something about it. But it has to come from other people. It is not anything that one goes around preaching from the house tops or forcing it on anyone or showing even someone ones anxiety that they ought to know some more about Gurdjieff. But if a statement is made about it and it is not entirely right or a little misunderstood, then it is quite possible to try to correct it.

But find out first what the level is of the meetings for them. Maybe they are superficial, maybenot. Maybe there is someone who takes initiative, It depends then on that kind of person, how he conducts the kind of meeting, what it will be, what he will allow. Is he the kind of person who would allow others to express an opinion or not. Are they genuinely interested. To some extent, I think they are. I do not know how deep it goes. But I think that the impulse, the moment of interest is really sincere. But, as soon as it comes to the question of do I really want to study or go to the library or buy a book for it or sit down and try to read it, aside from the fact even that reading the book implies something else according to Gurdjieff; that is, something that you must use or eat. Myabe that is a concept that not many people, particularly in the Unitarian Church, like. Do you know something about the Unitarian Church?

Taylor: I know a little bit.

Mr. Nyland: It is a little bit on the left side, you might say. Quite free, almost ethical. And altho there is something of terminology on a relgious basis, it is listening to it and saying how wonderful and so forth and this and that. It is like in tuen withthe infinite, you know. I am not disparaging about that but I am only saying it is not so deep.

Taylor: No, I don't think so. But there may be some people who...

Mr. Nyland: That might be. That is quite possible. For that reason, see what kind of questions they have. Go and find out. But do not go as a person who wants to say something. -??-.

Robert Viespi: On Friday evening I escorted a young lady here to the Friday evening who had asked me where I go on Tuesday nights. She told me she had read 'Search of the Miraculous'. Someone had given it to her to read. Before we came here I spent about an hour and fifteen minutes with her because she did not have much of an opportunity to ask me what the meetings where like and about

you and about the ideas. So, I spent that hout briefing her. And I did not know what to expect as a reaction after the meeting.

Mr. Nyland: Which one did she come to?

Robert: This past Friday. I was hopeful that it would mean something to her because I felt, as a personal observation, she was the kind of person who needed something and that she might be sensitive to this kind of thing. And I spoke with her after the meeting briefly only. And she seemed to be impressed and confused and eager to know more. And I spoke with her today in which she told me many things very positive about her reaction to the meeting. And she hoped to come again and that she wanted to read more books and so forth. My question is about me. I do not see her too often but I do speak to her on the phone very often. And I want to know, not how to be - I think I know how to be, but I do not know if I know how far to go. I have a tendancy to get excited too and to be hopeful that it will mean something and that it will not be just a passing inquiry on her part. But that is not right.

Mr. Nyland: How is it when you listen to a question; do you understand the question usually?

Robert: From her you mean?

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Robert: Well usually yes. I think she is a very bright girl and she has a peculiar way of asking questions and she is not ordinary. She does not akk simple questions.

Mr. Nyland: But it is a question that is more or less well enough formulated for you to knoe what she is trying to say?

Robert: Exactly.

Mr. Nyland: And when she says it, at least you can immediarely link it up to that what she is saying?

Robert: Almost every question she asked me Friday night before we came here was related to the work; I could relate it to the work for her.

Mr. Nyland: No, relate it first to her thoughts.

Robert: Yes, I did that.

Mr. Nyland: What I mean is: where does her question come from?

Robert: I know her well enough to know where it comes from.

Mr. Nyland: Good, because that goes back to whatever her experience is, what she has been exposed to, what she has taken on because of surroundings or what perhaps is formulated in her as a result of her own experience. It is important to know this because many times people will

use certain words that have no meaning whatsoever and only that they repeat it because father and mother have told them or thay have read it in a book. If you can make a distinction between that what is really her own, as coming from her and that what is outside, as it were, laid on, only answer that what is really hers. And answer it insuch a way that first you xxxxxxx assure her you understand what she means. Not by using the same words as she but to convey immediately in the beginning of your answer that emotionally you have a relationship towards that same question; as if that question also is yours. You see? And then with this you give her a result based on the question as if it was yours, which you answer for yourself. In doing that, you introduce your experience to her and for her then she will see that her question can lead to an experience on her own part. The other questions, they are a little superficial, leave them out. It does not matter. She probably finds an answer some where in a book. And if she again reformulates them as an essentail one for herself, then you can answer.

On the other hand, do not go too far in answering. Answer leaving just a little bit unanswered. You know? Then she will come back. When she does not come back, do not philosophize or be a professor.

Robert: I know. I have done that once before and I will not do that again.

Mr. Nyland: I know. One gets easily carried away. And of course it is quite understandable but one must xxx be very careful that you do not overfeed at that time. You have to wait until a person starts to grwo you might say, After a person grows, it does not matter. I do not believe this question of taking away the food for someone or chewing it for them, which sometimes is said that one overxxxxx talks. I think that a person who is gwowing, who is working, who is interested, not a person intellectually interested, for them it is no good to have more data; but a person where there is already something in their life that

wants to do something, that is, partly based on experience and partly on the hope that it is possible for them to do something; for such people one can talk a long long time and elucidate many things which, in such a conversation, probably are ~~x~~only understood less than ten percent. But it does not matter at all. You are not taking away anything because they cannot digest more. But they have to digest. Whatever they can digest, they take. The rest - let it go and they will let it go.

I do not believe in this question of an answer should be just like that every time. There are many different kinds of answers and there are also many different kind of questions. And a certain question requires a certain kind of an answer. A question that is a little superficial and a question that comes, even if it comes from the heart but is not as yet translated into an experience, has to be answered in such a way that you leave a little bit unsaid. On the other hand, I call it, a dynamic question you can go to twon if they let you. She will come this Friday?

Robert: I did not ask her. I am waiting ~~xxx~~ for her to tell me.

Mr. Nyland: Ask her.

Now, any practical questions?

Alice Watson: I have been trying to read Mr. King's book and some of it is good for me and some of it is -?- in my head. But in the beginning where he speaks of awareness and he elucidates seven points that must be done in order to be what he calles actively aware. And he said if you do not do all of these seven points you are not being actively aware. And I can never do seven. And he also says that you are actively aware of what is going on within 'its' mechanism that you are also equally aware of everything else going on outside. And I cannot do all that.

Mr. Nyland: So, according to Mr. ~~Mx~~ King you do not know what it is to be aware.

Alice: Apparantly not.

Mr. Nyland: And I would let it go at that. You know?

Alice: But it is very interesting to read about.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, it is interesting to read about and also it is inter-

Alice: I believe he did.

Mr. Nyland: I say it is interesting to hope that he *?- all seven.

Alice: These are what he calls the toddlers steps/

Mr. Nyland: Yes, yes, -?- walks fast. Alice, whenever I start in the beginning and after several years, certain terminology regarding work like awareness, like observation, like even the question of impartiality or the question of participation, all of that has at the present time, when I begin and as I continue, a certain meaning. That is, it is based on whatever my concept was and I try, if I try to define it, I try to define it as well as I can, what I understand by awareness.

When I continue to work, something can take place in my head and my intellect and the concepts in my head, that is, the concepts which are meantally clear to me become clearer, may also become more inclusive and may become more exact. As I now work and I am engaged in these concepts of awareness. trying to wake up. trying to see myself inpartially, as I do this my mental functions start to change slightly in one direction on another. I do not know really which direction because at first they will start to loosen up. And in that particular state of looseness, I do not want to say that I am going in a certain direction. All I do is prepare for a journey. And the looseness is necessary in order to as it were correct the particular thought process so that, when I have enough of a guide, tht I will guide then also my mind to go in a certain direction. So, I am not saying in the beginning wht will really take place if that is already going forward.

But at the same time, I have in my mind certain conceots which I now believe in, which I take. When I start to work. I try to put them in words, surely of a subjective nature, because even the word awareness and the word sleep, the word impartiality implies that there is something that

there is something that I understand with my mind at the present time of what might be meant by it. So, I go along and I gradually acquire something in my mind which starts to function a little differently. And with the concepts that I used to have about awareness, my concept changes. And what I niw call awareness today may not be the same as ten years from now, assuming for a moment that I will continue to grow.

Now, if it is necessary for full awareness to satisfy all seven points, I simply say full awareness at the present time is not possible for me as yet but I am on my way. I satisfy one point, two points. At the same time, it is not entirely correct what King says because, if I am aware for one moment, at that one moment I am aware on hundred percent. That is, the awarness that is possible for me at any one moment is absolute. And therefore, in that absoluteness I already experience all the seven and perhaps all the seven in one and perhaps even more; that I experience an awareness which at that moment I do not call awarness but I call it experience of a certain kind. And when I want to describe it afterwards I call it an experience of a certain kind of being on a different level, higher in accordance with my -?-

My whole concept, all the words I use, everything that takes place in my mind is constantly in a state of flux. And as I now try to become aware of this, that, legs and so forth, and I say from this, the totality; the thing that I am interested in is the method how to be aware. Afterwards I become interested in the object that can be taken in by that awareness. With other words, the circle of my focus, I would like to enlarge and instead of having just this as an awarness or, in a sensing exercise that I become aware of the existence of my arm, ~~xiny~~ that when I go around after a little while I get a dexterity, a certain

flexibility, a certain ability, a certain way of being able to handle this concept of awareness in a form but which then becomes for me practical; that then after that I can change the focus - like I change the focus in a photographic lens. I can have this and I can have it a little this; I can have it concentrated on one thing almosy to the point where, if I could become aware, I would start burning because it is so concentrated. At the same time, it may also be a very wide opwn lens that spreads out and sees all of me and see the ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ table and sees a little furt er and there I see this; all coming from one ~~xxxx~~ self point, a focal point of my own ~~xxxx~~, now functioning as an entity which has ability to be aware. And I grow entirely away from what is the original concept in my mind regarding observation.

I reach after that, by sufficient exercise, by sufficient work, I say ten years, twnety years, thiry years, no one really knows. I gradually come to certain concepts which I never have dreamed about because that what has taken over is a level of being and that what starts functioning as a body is not my mind any more. A mind is a part of a being, a component part. But it leads to the possibility of a being, which being can be and when it is, it can have, with enough development, certain functions which are comparable to my mind and comparable to my heart and comparably to my physucal existence.

So, when he talks about these seven things, he is talking about Earthly affairs. I am interested in it but not to the extent to fulfill all of them. Fir instance, I break down my behaviour into five different parts, gesture, posture, tone of voice, etc. Surely, if I, from the standpoint of being see myself as one, all my manifestations of behaviour are observed in that. But I do not put it in the form of one, two, three, four and five. I say, "I am." So that gradually, the amness represents myself. And in that everything I am is represented.

When I want to describe it, I go down a rung and I am now again on the level of the Earth. And I say "Yes, there is posture, gestnre, there is that."

You see, being is a strange kind of a concept that I really do not know enough about when I use my ordinary mind. But when I use that what I call an experience which deposits in my certain substances which is not my heart and it is not my mind, but it is a substance of my being, that then I come to what I always call the solidty of man. The solidity of man is something in a person which at certain times exists and one is aware of the existence. When I say solidity, I mean by that three dimensional. It does not mean solid. It means the opposite even. It is very light. It is much ligher than my ordinary matter of which I am built. And therefore, this particular strength of being depends on that what one is and the characteristics of that are two fold.

One is that it is a unit. The second is that it is lighter and not -?-. So, when I talk about being and from the standpoint of being becomeing as it were the observer, seeing that what I observe, then I do not need these seven rules any more and I really say I do not care because for me the way to reach it: I try to become aware of certain things at a certain time, as well as I can, dependant on the energy. But the taste I have of being one for one moment is sufficient for me to give the desire to continue to try to remain awake. And the awareness is not in the inclusion of everything I see from the standpoint of Earth. But the awarness is to seek the Kingdom of Heaven first and then all seven points I will be able to see. So, Daly goes at it the wrong way; I am sorry. It may be a stimulating book just the same.

Alice; Yes, it is.

Mr. Nyland: He would like to make it too scientific - but it is not work. Work is different.

Alice: Is it medical -?-

Mr. Nyland: No, it is an intellect trying to become a scientist.

Alice: He uses some words that are not in the dictionary.

Mr. Nyland: He has a right to coin his owb words. That part is alright. No, the way to go at is not thru this- altho it is a good valuable book. I have recomended it. It is very good because it is an attempt to explain in a scientific way more or less scientif ideas so that they could become acceptable to the rest of scientif workd which is not Gurdjieff.

But one works not that way, One starts with awareness. One starts with a wish to see. After that, one tries to see what one wishes. So that the motivating power for oneself is not any more in ones intellect. It is in ones heart. In the beginning it is a mental function. It then combines or rather has been started by a wish from solar plexus. Sometimes I have said it is like the subcenter of the intellect which is emotionally colored. It is a quibbling about words. But there is something as a relationship between something I call a higher wish in myself which is my solar plexus functioning in the direction of my heart. It is not my heart but it is something of a different kind of quality, as it were, as close as I can bring it to the line separating consciousness from unconsciousness.

With this, I use my mind to have the concept clear of what is meant by awareness. That is, the seeing or the observing. I put it to work regarding my body, establishing the relationship between my mind and my body. And I keep pushing it around, as it were, forcing it to remain dymamic by a wish which is constantly fed from ym solar plexus. Because of this, there is a certain unity that become apparant for myself when I am concentradedly trying to work. Because of this unity, the emphasis of that what is now making my work shifts; and it shifts from the mind

to the heart and it is no longer in the solar plexus. It becomes a deep seated wish. And then, from that my wish is not to understand. My wish is to be. And with the being I will gain understanding because in the being knowledge changes to understanding. My emotion, that is, the wish from solar plexus will change into a deep emotional realization of my existence. It has to do with the plan and the purpose of myself; to find myself at a certain place where I belong; and physically my being has chnaged in such a way that whatever there is of motions, movements in the behaviour forms of my ordinary physucal ~~existence~~ expression is exactly correct in accordance with the amount of energy required and no more and mo less.

It is a tremendous change as far as physique is concerned and in that level of being my physucal body is relaxed but in the state, as I have siad many times, of Mars. That is, it is ready ay any one time to act. It need not act as being. Once, you remember, I said about being there are two possibilities in being. One is a static one; the fact of existing. The other is the active one! being manifesting itself in its component parts or even on its level. Again, there are two possibilites there. But usually, as far as we are concerned, we are interested in the componant parts. Then I call being again changing into participation. But the requirement for that participation is the remaining aware.

Is it clear? Is this clear what I said just now?

John Marshall: It is clear except for one thing that I find trouble with. When to let go of the mind. As you just said, the wish has to eventually transfer from the solar plexus to the heart.

Mr. Nyland: Only by working it will go. You do not have to direct it.

John: But I find when I tried to let it go ...

Mr. Nyland: Then you do not work. You have to continue to work. You

have to continue to keep this dynamic process between the three centers going. With other words, I have to keep on trying to remain awake. I have to keep on keeping my mind being aware of the functioning of my body.

John : But most often I find my mind going thru a trend of thought and I try to brin it back.

Mr. Nyland: Alright, alright, then you are not working.

John : The thing is how to let the mind ...

Mr. Nyland: When you realize that you have lost it, come back to being aware. The chnage between awareness, that is, a state of awakeness and again unconsciousness, you do not know. It is very difficult to know it. There are possibilities of knowing it. But, in general, one does now know it. What I do know is this: I am awake as a result of making an attempt. A little later I discover I am not awake any more. But then, when I discover that I was awake and then fell asleep means to me that I again am interested in waking up. So, the statement that I mkae that I have been asleep has in it the possibility of being awake again. Right? Then I wake up again. Then I make again the effort.

John : Very often when I try I start thinking about the results I am looking for or I try to come back to the reason I want to be awake.

Mr. Nyland: Why? Why?

John: Because I find that my mind keeps on rambling.

Mr. Nyland: John, it is not true. You now talk. You are awake, as you talk and listen you lose it. There will be a moment when you become quite aware of having been awleep or rather, that you are still more or less asleep or you become aware that you have lost something. At that moment you do not go over inot a thought or a feeling. You are not going to explain to you why you have lost it. You simply say, "I have lost it but I wake up again." You know what I mean when I say I make an attempt to be awake?

John : Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Alright. If you know that, you see, that at that moment it is that you have to make up, I call it, you have to make up your mind. It is determination. It is something in which I change myself; something in me changes regarding myself. Something in me looking at myself, that something changes. I consider as if that what I see is changing.

You remember once I explained it a couple of timrs with the three lines and the angle coming forward and going away. It is psychological. You can read it in Daly King's book. It is very interesting. It has a certain term - it does not matter what it is psychologically. That angle, that coming forward or receeding does not change. You change. But it looks as if that what you see is changing. This is the process of awareness. This what I am does not change. That what is the observer changes in regard to this. I ascribe it first to that what changes. Then I realize that the observer has changed. So now, in this last couple of minutes, how often have you lost yourself.

John: Quite often.

Mr. Nyland: And at the timr when you say, "I have lost myself", did you bring it back?

John: I tried to but then I ...

Mr. Nyland: Try it now, try it now. As you speak. As you now speak, you make an attempt. You want to keep yourself as it were awake and you know it goes. And the energy you have, you speak slowly. You catch it. You catch it at the moment when you see it almost dribbling away and you are very careful. You do not want it. You bring it back. And you are - it is like a tug of war.

You see, gradually I want to know when I lose it. The same way as when I want to know when I close my eyelids that I go over into a

sleeping state. What is it in me, when I try to see the distinction between being awake in the Gurdjieffian sense and ordinary sleep during the day; what is it that can be compared to eyelids closing? Loss of interest, loss of interest in work. When I lose that I close my eyes. Pretty soon I will be asleep. But when I keep my eyes open, that is, eyelids open regarding the necessity of my wish to work; if the wish to work is sufficiently developed that I am aware of that wish, I will know when that wish goes down in intensity. That is the time I catch myself opening my eyelids again. I said a little while ago, one can find out when one loses consciousness. Alright? Try it.

Trudy Bartel: Mr. Nyland, you said it is loss of interest in work at the moment. Well, I have found that when I have a moment of awareness which is usually in silence, I even can talk, but there is something like an inner silence and I become aware; that when I lose it or when I am about to lose it, there is an inner wave, an inner wave that is stronger than my holding on.

Mr. Nyland: What is the inner wave from?

Trudy: It can be every day life taking over, an outside thought coming in.

Mr. Nyland: That is where you lose the interest.

Trudy: Is it interest? I lose the strength but I do not lose interest.

Mr. Nyland: Good. I call it simply that the energy goes or is taken up by something else from the outside or something that is already inside which then takes the energy away/ Then there is no energy left for staying awake.

Trudy: I can see it coming.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, can you do something about it? I do not deny you can see it coming. But then, can you oppose it? You can of course; one can. One can keep being awake by seeing what will take it away. But sometimes you have to fight quite hard; and sometimes you have to go back and withdraw on that what is there no effected by the outside world. If there is something like an inner silence, it can be

compared to what I said a little while ago about the solidity of oneself. The characteristic of that: I am always there the same and that the outside world with all the impressions can never effect that. It always is there. It is the residue of my I. That is, if I see that there is a possibility that I might lose myself in activity because of certain impressions coming in, to which I logically react, I withdraw and then that what effects me from the outside world cannot come to where I am. I wait for a moment probably because I cannot immediately continue exactly in the same way as before. I need a certain form of energy for withdrawing. I do not lose my awareness but I am not able to express it. That can take plade. And this is the wave that takes it, really that I can see it as if it is coming, as if it pushes me. If I direct it right and I remain open, that what comes from the outside pushes me even in, in order to save me.

It is a very interesting thing that there is no antagonism on the part of an outside impression coming. It is not that impressions immediately want its way. It is perfectly willing to push me inside so that I can regain myself. And if I then, from that, see this, there is no hostility. I go back participating this time in that what is the outside influence and the reaction towards that then becomes full of awareness.

It is quite true. There are these things. There is almost that fading and again this regaining. And in a conversation or when, particularly regarding voice, it is something that is absolutely possible to keep constantly aware of ones voice by modulating it, by changing it; at any one time, in any way, one constantly can remain aware of it. One can also do it with ones hands. It is quite possible to make hands move in such a way that one is constantly aware of them. And as long as there are a couple of such things of ones body, more than three, I am awake. The three points of the triangle -??-.

Trudy: May I ask one more question please? You mention types very often Mr. Nyland. I do not know my type. How do I recognize it? How much xx can I or could I be master of it? Or do I simply have to accept it?

Mr. Nyland: You first stidy yourself. You are not master. You have to see that the type of a person is dependant on how he was brought up, what he is biologically and what he has at that time, the moment of conception or xxx birth, astrologically.

Trudy: It is inevitable then.

Mr. Nyland: There are inevitable parts of it which fortunately not all have grown out. Thah what is grown out is the sociological part. You remember there are three different ways, biologically - father, mother and ancestors, astrologically - moment of conception and moment of birth, whatever the stars and otherxxxxxxx outside influences are, sociologically that what is a development of that what is the beginning first as embryo, then as gestation, then as child, growing into a certain xxxxxxx surroudning economically, politically, whatever it may be, geographically. That I call sociological influence. That what I now aqquire as characteristic is very often sociological, dependent on where I live and how I am taught this and that, education and everything that goes with it. And what I appear to the outside work is that part, that one third which is mouh more developed in me and for ordinary usage than the other two. The other two are still there. They do not come out so often and I do not know myself than only if I take away this outside covering. Then I say I am a little bit more essentialx which really means I am a little closer to my type.

Now, the type that I am is three fold in the first place, accordint to man number one, two or three. It depends entirely on the development of any one of these three centers in their particular function in relatio to the other centers. Therefore, I make subcenters because I want to indicate that in each center there is a possibility of linking up with any on the others. So, I must divide each center into three. Thxsx

means I have already nine types. You know, it is easy. And I indicate this by, 1-1-1, 1-2-3, 1-2-1; all the combinations I can make out of 1-1-1, 2-2-2, 3-3-3. I will duplicate them and there are really not nine but, in any event, it is sufficient for our conversation to say that there are nine because sometimes it is this way and sometimes it is the reverse. It depends where the accent is.

Now, to come from these three types multiplied to 3 to 27. I have to introduce again each one in accordance with its own into three different component parts. It would make 27, it would make 81. I do not go that far. I cannot understand it. I have to go in another direction in order to make it more palatable to myself. That is, 1-1-1, totally is me. That becomes 4. You see, it is different because that totality of my three centers represents a certain unit which I represent as a personality. This now, as 4, is the bridge between 3 and 4; 3 going into 4. Now, 4 is applicable to any one of the 3 so that the totality, based on 3 and 4 becomes 12.

Now I am back on the Zodiac. So I understand now what is the difference between 3 and 4. If I now put myself into 4 groups of 3 or 3 groups of 4, it depends entirely what I am emphasizing. When I emphasize myself I make myself 4 groups of 3. When I emphasize outside conditions, I make myself into 3 groups of 4. The 4 are then comparable on the Zodiac as the elements - Earht, fire, water, air. So, when I now start to make combinations, I have first a grouping in accordance to 12; each sign related to another sign of the Zodiac, either as a water sign or as a sign beginning its own quarter. That is different. Out of this, I get not only 12, but I get 3 times 12 or 4 times 12. But I start to give them numbers, that is, figures; explaining in figures the value of each; the same way as I explain

regarding my physical center the value of one or two or three. The predominance of all three of a higher development of all three centers is 3-3-3. This is the maximum that a man as a type can have. The lowest is 1-1-1. In general, people are 1, maybe 2 as far as physique is concerned, very seldom 3. Emotionally they are usually 2 or 3; intellectually many times only 1. So the picture of man is really 2-3-1 Or 2-2-1. And that the development for any one person is in the direction not to become 3-3-3 but to become a combination that is sufficiently uniform to fit into each other.

That is a difficult thing to understand. It is not 3-3-3; it is not 2-2-2; it is not 1-1-1. But the 1 is counteracted sometimes by the 2 of emotion or the 3 of emotion or the 2 or the 3 or even the 1 of intellect. It depends on what one understands by harmony. In this form of harmony, I have to ~~xx~~ take myself as a part of the 12, either the triad or the quarter, in relation to that what is outside of me as the elements, with what I am inside as being able to react in accordance with what I am.

Now, for this, how I am inside, I have to introduce the influence of the planets. For that I start to make a horoscope in accordance with, if I can, heliocentric instead of geocentric, altho the degrees do not differ very much. I now start to introduce what we call houses in astrology. And the influence on me at certain times in my life, moment of birth, certain events, whenever it is the day of the horoscope drawn for a certain time, then I am inside, in accordance with the planets, effected and outside with the different earth, water, air and fire signs.

It makes it a little bit more complicated because of course it is not entirely true that only the planets effect me. Naturally there is the sun as a fundamental one and the moon. But also the planets

effect each other so I do not get a direct relationship of Saturn on me. But I get it via the influence of Jupiter if it happens to be in the neighborhood; so that the totality of influence of Jupiter-Saturn on me and also is a little bit influenced by the condition I am on Earth, where I am on Earth; that I am effected by the full moon, new moon, growing moon, waning moon.

So, you see, when you come to that, then my type can be almost any kind of a mixture at any one time so that, when I say He is Aries or he is Capricorn, there are certain chracteristics that belong to that. There are many others that do not belong to it at all. And the extreme difficulty in astrology is exactly the find out what a person is, not only at the time of birth or when he has been conceived, but how he has grown sociologically by making adjustments as he had to meet wertain conditions which again, astrologically, can be described.

So, his type, when it represents the personality is a very complicated affair and it cannot be immediately said he is that and that type. It is good for a general popular science but in reality it is not. And if you take, for instance, let's say I am Scorpio. I can say, yes, I am pure Scoprio. What is it? If I behave in a certain way in accordance with Scorpio under the influence of Mars, which is my ruling planet, then if in the same house there is a certain time Saturn and Jupiter together, the influence of Mars is practically nil. If it happens to be with the waning moon, it is one way; if it is with the rising moon, it is the other way. If it is early in the morning it is different because the sun is different early in the morning as compared to noon. And therefore, to make a description of that, I would have to study myself very carefully, how am I regarding the influences of the planets which are relfected in me as states of myself.

So, when I say when I look at my inner type, the innter factor, not the outside according to 4, but the inner according to either seven or three within one, that is, if my emotional states can at times be described as planets, then I know where my motivations come from, which at times, effect my behaviour forms. And my behaviour form is again effecotd by that what is on the outside.

So, altho as Scoprio I want to say something, when I am effected by the outside conditions I will not say it. Still, I remain Scoprio. So, my behaviour form does not express what I am. It is a complicated thing. It is not that easy. In a general way one starts to define more and more in what grouping one belings and also at certain times certain expressions in ones own life have a very definite coloration. So that the extent of how I am effected by outside conditions and the way I react, the deeper and intenser it is, the more really I would be. At the same tine, when I divide myself in 12 different parts, when I am on the border line between, let's say, Pisces and Aries, where do I belong on the 21st of March? Where do I really belong? I am influenced by this tremendous momentum that comes from Pisces and I am not as yet going up on the curve of Aries. And again, ff I take that as far as Aries is concerned, it is quite different than Cancer and it is different from Capricorn becayse at that time it is like a curve touching the line of solstitium whereveee the 23 degrees above or the 23 degrees below the Tropic of Cancer and the Tropic of Capricorn. When I touch that I go as a curve like this; whereas if I go at Aries or at Libra, I go straight thru like this. So, the time that is spent in one day is an entirely different time that I have to spend when I am nearing the top or the maximum or the minimum. Also that effects me Zodiacally. As I say, it is quite a complicated thing.

Now, for the time being, to make it practical ~~xxxxxxx~~ regarding oneself. I study myself in relation to different people I believe are different types from me, And I see what the reaction is. How do I react to such people who I try to describe as different types? For instance, I can distinguish an intellectual type from an emotional one. I am an emotional one. I want to see what is my ~~xxxxxx~~ reaction regarding an intellectual type? Where do I differ? Where do I get effected? Where do I want to say something emotionally against that? What ~~xxxx~~ hurts me? Or what do I like?

With physical types it is the same kind of thing. There is a world that they are interested in. This is a simple way because there is a possibility of distinguishing between one, two and three. And it is interesteding to find out why I am what I am. And in accordance with the reaction towards other people, I find out what I really am. Altho I may think I am an intellectual type, I may turn out to be much more emotional. And I will find that out by reacting in accordance with other types, according to the -?- outside of me.

With this, I start to work with a working hypothesis of myself, what I am as a type. And I put myself in different kind of surroundings where any one of the three different kinds that I now am aware of myself has to respond. It has to go into a certain activity. For instance, I say I am emotionally more or less developed, intellectually not so much and physically nothin.g. I put myself in a situation which requires an emotional response. And I do not get it. Something which I experience, it leaves me cold.

For instance, I say I love animals.Well, that would be an emotional quality. I put myself with animals or even with a sick anaimal and I see do I really want to help them or not; and is my saying I love

animals has based on something that is ethically correct or is it really my type? I have to learn to find out what is laid on, as it were an acquired characteristic which at the present time I still consider my type, which is not.

Once, you remember, I mentioned about chief feature; how absolutely necessary it is to undo oneself completely of the covering which education, sociology and so forth has put on one so that I cannot find cheif feature until I am essentially something, almost naked, without any particular reason for even wanting to express myself and then to see what I then am. So that sometimes, in cheif feature, when I am drunk I am much closer to the possibility of seeing it as when I try constantly in my mind to define my chief feature. I will never be able to do.

In exactly the same way, I will find out my type by undoing this kind of covering. I call it an acquired characteristic. That is, that is its the official name for it. That is the way I live in life, how I make my ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ adaptations, how I am with other people. I become a personality of a certain kind that other people recognize. I am not that what I represent. But the closer I can come to myself of really what I am, I will find out that when I say I love animals, I do not love them at all and there is nothing in me to love them so that they could die. Intellectually probably I will say, Yes, I habe to make sure that I water a plant. And now, if I do not and I see the plant dropping, what do I feel? Do I feel sorry? Do I feel guilty? Or do I say, it is alrught; it will come to. I will give it a little water.

This way I find out what I really have; and this, I would almost say, is a very difficult thing because there are many things that I believe of myself that are not at all so. When once I talked about who has a chance of finding our what kind of emotions he really knows by experience

and what emotions does he think he has, he will come to the conclusion that there are very few emotions you have and the rest is an adaptation that one says, I have pity. Do I really have pity? And if I have pity, with whom?

There are diffierent things in relation to that that makes me express that I have pity as an emotional quality which I base entirely on an intellectual understanding. And with that, I am not equipped as yet to find out for myself what I really am. Now, if I start to judge myself in relation to other people, I will come to conclusions of myself. Out of this, I will now know what are the motivating forces in my life. On that I will see what is my type. And I now check it in my life, knowing what my type is, how it has developed in relation to cóndtions from the outside where either I gave up or where I insisted. Then I come to a real understanding of that what I say is typical or that what I have experienced was still outside. Now you can work with it, if you can.

Marvin Schwartz: About two weeks ago you spoke of people in the work going thru a certain stage where they are between one shore and another and they do not see either. I do not assume necessarily that this applies to me at the present time. But in past weeks I believe I have made some kind of efforts to work. And I will not use the word flat but I have had some success. It has not been flat but it has been nothing extraordinary. And yet I feel I was awake to some extent and the state was preferable to me ordinary state because there was an absence of things, to say the least. And I did have some sense of presence at these times. And this is also different from previously when I beliebe that my attempts at waking up where ~~xxx~~ wrong attempts, not based on relaxation or as much relaxation as I could achieve. And without substance previously but now with some very small amount of substance. But coupled with this is a realization of my loss on interest in practically everything in life. And I think with this a sort of hidden motivation to find things which henuinely interest me and work would be one of these and the state of being awake would therefore be something I would like forward to and expect. It is not dead in these few moments that I have ~~tried~~. It is not much. I mean, it is .,. I make an attempt to wake up and I am a little present ...

Mr, Nyland: Is the picture of a row boat on the river, between two shores, is that something that more or less appeals to you?

Marvin: No, it does not appeal.

Mr. Nyland: You see, if you have lost something and not as yet something else, you are in that position.

Marvin: Yes, I would think that is where I am but I am not sure.

Mr. Nyland: The only thin is that you are rowing slowly. One shore has disappeared. The other is not there as yet. I think it is in the nature of work. I think it is much easier to see certain things that one has had and to lose them or to lose interest as against building something that is new. It is the same thing. It is easier to wreck a house than to build it. And it is really that kind of process. I start almost with a vengence to try to find out what is wrong with me. Or rather, that I feel I want to wake up. There are many things that are in the way. And I forget that it is necessary to put something in its place. It is only much later that there are certain things that I do not want to give up, that I do not want to lose unless there is something in its place. But in the beginning and for quite some time, it is much easier to see what is wrong or to see that I ought to lose it and actually lose interest in that because it has no more meaning. And, instead of that, to get something that has a meaning.

For one thing, that what I lose belongs to the Earth. That what I want to build is not of this Earth. So therefore, the material that I attack and that I lose is already there and I recognize it. That what I want to build is material that is not there as yet and I do not know enough about it. This is the reason why the one breaking down speed is quite different from the building up speed. As a result, I am in between something where I have lost interest and not as yet enough to take its place. It is an unfortunate kind of a situation. And sometimes it entails a great deal of suffering because one does not want to have a condition in which you do not feel at ease. You know, one does not want tht kind of condition. One wants to have a certain assurance that one is constantly

with solid ground under ones feet. And you do not like to be up in the air.

Marvin: I would say more that my usual state is familiar to me. That is why I prefer it. Whereas, when I do become awake, it is a little strnage and I feel like a fish out of water and I do not prefer it for that reason. I think my real motivation in asking this question is that I know within a short time I am going to come to a point where I will want to work more. I think I will. And I just want to know your opinion on whether what I have said to you, which is really not too good a description. would indicate anything incorrect about what I am doing.

Mr. Nyland: No, only row a little faster.

Marvin: You mean work more?

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Marvin: One trouble is I have time. There is time. During the day nothing can be done because I work and so forth. But in the evening I have time but the same thing happens practically every evening. I do not create things for myself to do.

Mr. Nyland: Do it early in the morning then Marvin, before you go to the office or wherever you go.

Marvin: I do not think that that actually would be difficult for me becasue I have very bad morning habits so to speak. Of course, that is something to attack.

Mr. Nyland: That would be just the kind of a task then.

Marvin: But what disturbs me is in the evening; I just more or loss lie around.

Mr. Nyland: Marvin, you cannot have your pie and eat it.

Marvin: No, I do not want that. But if I say to myself: what can I do? Let's say seep the floor, take a walk, this or that. It seems arbitrary. I have no interest in it and therefore ...

Mr. Nyland: Very simply. Get up a little earlier. Why sweep the floor?

Marvin: I am interested in the evening now becalse the evening is a waste of time.

Mr. Nyland: The evning is not good. I am interested in the times that would be really much more condusive. And I am interested in trying to find out what you really do not want to do. Let's do it. For one week Marvin. Alright? That is what I mean by rowing a little faster.

Marvin: I will get up real early.

John, how is it working for you?

John Marshall: Alright.

Mr. Nyland: You become clear now on the attempt you must make when you have lost it? What Trudy and I talked about - this question of the wave. The world is not against you. You are against the world. If you take the proper attitude you can go with the world as it goes, adapt yourself, not wishing it to be different, but you to remain awake regardless of that what takes place on you and whatever is the influence on you. And you take them but whichever way they come. You take them even and say, temporarily they get me a little unconscious, I push them back again.

It is a very interesting thing that one really say, yes, there is a (?crowd?) that I push. I push gently back again until some how or other it disperses until another little conglomeration, another little force on me and I say, no I do not want it. It is like swimming in the water. You see, if you do not swim, you go down. If you move your hands and arms in swimming the water is willing. At the same time, it offers enough of a force for you to swim. This is ones life in outside conditions. It will drown you. It will come in on you. But you can use it as a force against which you will want to keep above water.

If you think of this last part, how you can look at life as you know it and what life, as you know it, can give you and do not wait until the evning. During the day, whenever you can, you make attempts., The times will be like stars. It will not be as yet combined sufficiently that all the stars together will make even a suh. It will be a little bit of a reflected light like the moon; sometimes as if one is already effected by it in such a way that it is not dark but moonlight in the dark. At the same time, it is not sunshine.

We want to work towards the sun and/to bring out of the multitude of stars one sun requires much more unity. But much more unity is the difference between man number one, two and three and all the rest of four, five, six and seven. When that itself is there, Great Nature enters and it is not an extension of that what we are in ordinary life. It is the introduction of that what one believes to be the bridge.

To the extent that I can understand objectivity as something not subjective, gradually clarifying out of that kind of concept what the reality of objectivity is. For a long time I have to be satisfied to use, to row with the oars I have. Finally maybe I will walk on streets of gold. Who knows? But we must work.
So, maybe next week, we will talk again. Good night everybody.